

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Please include the attached additional Figure 9.

REMARKS

The September 30, 2005 Office Action objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). In particular, the Office Action asserts that the method claims 24-27 must be shown or the features cancelled from the claims.

In response to this objection, FIG. 9, which depicts the method set forth in claims 24-27, is added. Additionally, the specification has been amended to make reference to FIG. 9 in the Brief Description Of The Drawings as well as adding a description of FIG. 9. The amendments to the specification and drawings are fully supported by the written description as originally filed and originally filed claims 24-27, which form part of the specification. Accordingly, applicants submit that no new matter is added and entry of FIG. 9 and the above amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4-12, 16, 17 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,585,125 to Peek. According to the Office Action, Peek discloses an upper bell 32 with a waist 34 and a circumferential ring 66, 266 in the label mounting area.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 23 and 24 to require that the angular extent of the waist (326) is greater than about 90°. This Amendment is supported by the originally filed disclosure at, for example, paragraph [0039] and Fig. 6. In view of the present Amendments, applicants respectfully traverse the rejection set forth in the Office Action.

Peek discloses a manual grip indentation 34 (See Fig. 1, 2 and Column 3 lines 20-22). The manual grip indentation as disclosed in Peek is typical of circumferential rings present in the prior art as shown in, for example, Fig. 1 of the present application. As discussed in the present application at, for example, paragraph [0038], the circumferential rings present in prior art

containers have particular attributes. Specifically, circumferential rings in the prior art have an angular extent that is from about 45° to about 90°. Such circumferential rings, as well as their use and purpose, are discussed in the specification as referenced above as well as in U.S. Patent No. 5,303,834 to Krishnakumar at, for example, column 5 lines 42-60. The present invention differs from the prior art by having, among other things, a waist in the dome that has an angular extent of greater than 90°. A conventional circumferential ring can be present the label mounting region. Peek does not disclose a waist in the dome having an angular extent of greater than about 90°. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-12, 16, 17 and 19-23, in view of Peek have been rendered moot.

The Office Action also rejects claims 3, 13-15, 18 and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Peek, taken alone or in combination with other references. Specifically, claims, 24-26 are rejected as obvious over Peek taken alone; claim 3 is rejected as obvious over Peek in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,762,221 to Tobias et al.; claims 13-15 and 27 are rejected as obvious after Peek in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,257,433 to Ogg et al.; and claim 18 is rejected as obvious over Peek in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,303,834 to Krishnakumar et al. Applicants respectfully traverse. None of the secondary references cited by the Examiner overcome the deficiencies of Peek as outlined above. In particular, none of the cited references disclose a container having a dome that includes a waist with an angular extent of greater than about 90°. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the Office Action. Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider all previously outstanding objections and

rejections and that they be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner indicate the Allowability of claims 1-27, and the application pass to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions which might be amenable to a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact undersigned counsel to discuss such issues. If any fee not otherwise provided with papers accompanying this amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to charge our deposit account No. 22-0261, and notify undersigned counsel accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 30, 2006

::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS1\712038\1


Keith G. Haddaway, Ph.D.
Registration No. 46,180
VENABLE
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Telefax: (202) 344-8300